DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 291 290 HE 021 157

AUTHOR	Carbone, Robert F.
TITLE	Fund Raisers of Academe.
INSTITUTION	Clearinghouse for Research on Fund Raising, College Park, MD.
SPONS AGENCY	EXXON Education Foundation, New York, N.Y.; Maryland Univ., College Park. Dept. of Education Policy, Planning, and Administration.; Maryland Univ., College Park. Inst. for Research in Higher and Adult Education.
PUB DATE	87
NOTE	25p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Clearinghouse for Research on Fund Raising, 3112 Benjamin Building, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742 ($5.00).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Characteristics; *Career Development; College Administration; Educational Background; Educational Finance; Finance Occupations; *Fund Raising; Higher Education; *Institutional Advancement; Job Satisfaction; Occupational Aspiration; Occupational Mobility; Occupational Surveys; *Professional Development; Professional Training

ABSTRACT

This study was conducted to examine career development and professionalization in the fund-raising vocation in colleges and universities. A sample of 500 fund raisers was drawn from over 5,000 members of the Council for Advancement and Support of Education who say their primary responsibilities and interests are in fund-raising. A two-page questionnaire was sent to each, and 206 (a response rate of just over 40%) responded. The results included the following: (1) academic fund-raisers are predominantly middle-aged white men with a high level of educational attainment (a mean age of 40.5 years with 61% holding master's degrees and 23% doctoral degrees); (2) they are employed by relatively large institutions that offer both undergraduate and graduate study; (3) of the 204 reporting the number of years in their current position, only 16% have been in their current jobs for more than 5 years; (4) volunteer experiences were the major influence on the choice of fund raising as a career; (5) working in a development office was the single most important source of training in fund raising; and (6) upward mobility is more likely by moving to another institution. Suggestions are offered for the professionalization of the fund-raising field, and the meaning and implications of the results are discussed. (KM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED291290

Fund Raisers of Academe

by Robert F. Carbone

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Robert F. Carbone
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

NE021 157

Clearinghouse for Research on Fund Raising
1987

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

2

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR RESEARCH ON FUND RAISING

The Clearinghouse for Research on Fund Raising collects and abstracts theses, dissertations, and other research studies on fund raising and related institutional advancement activities. Researchers are encouraged to submit reports of relevant studies for review by the Clearinghouse staff.

In addition to this monograph, the Clearinghouse has published

An Agenda for Research on Fund Raising

1986.

Copies of this publication may be obtained for $5 each from

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR RESEARCH ON FUND RAISING
3112 Benjamin Building
University of Maryland, College Park
College Park, MD 20742
(301) 454–5766

Funds for the preparation of this monograph
were provided by
The Exxon Education Foundation.

Joint sponsors of the project titled
Research on Fund Raising and Professional Development of Fund Raisers
which produced this monograph are:

Department of Education Policy, Planning, and Administration
Donald R. Warren, Chairman

and

Institute for Research on Higher and Adult Education
Robert O. Berdahl, Director

© 1987 by Robert F. Carbone
Printed in the United States of America

Contents

Acknowledgements	
Introduction	1
Who Are The Fund Raisers of Academe?	2
About This Study	3
Demographics	3
Academic Backgrounds	4
Current Positions	5
Years in Current Positions	6
Seeking New Positions	7
Introduction to the Field	8
Learning the Craft	9
Becoming a Fund Raiser	10
Career Paths	11
Sense of Professionalism	13
Making Fund Raising More Professional	15
Comment and Speculation	17

Acknowledgments

This monograph is the last of three activities made possible by a grant from the Exxon Education Foundation. The first was a June 1985 seminar in Washington, D.C., which brought together forty fund raisers, consultants, association executives, and scholars interested in fund raising and in those who practice this vocation. Our discussions focused on what research needed to be done to increase understanding of fund raising and the practice of institutional advancement.

That seminar led to the second activity, publication of *An Agenda For Research On Fund Raising*, issued by the Clearinghouse in 1986. One of the agenda items cited in that initial Clearinghouse publication was the need to study career development and professionalization in the fund raising vocation. The publication you hold in your hands is an attempt to satisfy that need.

I am grateful to Robert L. Payton, now of the University of Virginia, who provided funding for these activities in his former role as President of Exxon Education Foundation. His efforts to encourage scholarly study of philanthropic activity, which go far beyond this modest set of projects, have been a signal contribution to the field. For these efforts, we all owe him our thanks.

Encouragement and assistance for this publication was also provided by Vice President Vivienne Lee of the Council for Advancement and Support of Education. Thanks to her and to Gerard Celak of the CASE staff who assisted in drawing the sample of potential respondents.

In addition, a vote of appreciation is due all those fund raisers in academe who took the time to respond to my inquiries. Without them, there would be no publication. I am grateful to Lilli Milder whose comments on the manuscript were very helpful. It is appropriate to recognize also Paulette Moore who assisted in designing the survey instrument, Angela Carbone for her help in tabulating and organizing the responses, and Mary Gillot who prepared the manuscript for printing.

It is my responsibility, of course, to accept credit or blame for all the information, assertions, conclusions, and speculation that appear here.

Robert F. Carbone
College Park, Maryland
1987

Introduction

The fiscal health of American colleges and universities, in recent years at least, has depended increasingly on the effectiveness of an interesting and diverse cadre of men and women. They are the fund raisers of academe.

There is an extensive literature on professors, deans, and presidents, but relatively little has been written about staff members of academic institutions who devote their time and energies to fund raising. This monograph reports a study of the backgrounds and careers of fund raising personnel and their attitudes about the important work they do.

As anyone familiar with higher education knows, the titles these fund raisers hold vary greatly. Some are called vice presidents or vice chancellors; some are executive directors, deans, assistants to presidents; others are presidents of institutionally-related foundations.

More diverse yet are the portfolios that define their responsibilities. Those with the most lofty titles are often vice presidents (vice chancellors) for institutional advancement, responsible for a wide variety of related activities—fund raising, alumni programs, public relations and publications, grantsmanship, government relations, and in some cases student recruitment and admissions (or, as it has come to be called, enrollment management). The term "institutional advancement" has wide acceptance, largely through the efforts of CASE, the Council for Advancement and Support of Education.

Other portfolio designations commonly used to identify fund raisers are development, public affairs, and institutional relations. Of these, "development" is the one that causes some confusion since colleges and universities have professors who teach "human development," staffers who operated "developmental studies" programs for underprepared students, and directors of "international development" programs concerned with nation building overseas.

Interestingly, many of these institutional advancement officers in academic institutions seem to shy away from calling themselves fund raisers. There is, however, a large and active organization of fund raisers that does not share this aversion—The National Society of Fund Raising Executives. It has 9,000 members, many of whom are associated with academe but most of whom work for non-profit organizations and other voluntary associations.

Titles and portfolios aside, the raison d'être for these institutional advancement experts is easily stated: Increasing the fiscal assets of institutions through programs that build understanding and monetary support of graduates, parents, friends, community members, public officials, foundations, corporations, and society in general.

Until recent decades most academic fund raisers worked in non-public institutions dependent on private sources of funding. As more and more public dollars moved to budgets of independent and church-related colleges and universities, leaders in public higher education mounted appeals for private gifts. It is not uncommon now for large comprehensive institutions, both public and independent, to employ 50 or more advancement officers and to budget several million dollars a year for activities that support their fund raising efforts.

Given all the above, it seems fair to ask: How much do we know about college and university fund raisers? That story is exactly what this monograph seeks to tell.

Who Are the Fund Raisers of Academe?

Just who are the academic fund raisers? Since rising costs and, in some cases, falling enrollments cause serious financial problems in many colleges and universities, it is appropriate to focus attention on campus officers charged with attracting dollars that help keep college classrooms lighted and faculty paychecks in the mail.

What are the backgrounds of academic fund raisers? In what kind of institutions do they work? What are the fields of their own academic study? Do they have advanced degrees? If so, in what disciplines or professional fields? What is the ratio of male to female fund raisers? How old are they? Are any of them members of minority groups?

What are their career paths; that is, how did they get to the positions they currently hold? Why did they leave positions held earlier? How long did they serve in those positions? Are they currently interested in finding new positions? If so, why?

What stimulated their interest in fund raising as a career? What experiences—educational, work, or from everyday life—contributed to their abilities as fund raisers? What are their views regarding professionalization of the fund raising vocation? What do they think would help make fund raising resemble more closely the so-called "true professions"?

These are the questions posed to a substantial group of academic fund raisers. Their responses provide an interesting profile of these influential actors on the academic scene—a profile heretofore missing from the literature about higher education. The subjects of this study are not academicians who teach students, conduct scholarly research, and write books. Neither are they administrators in the traditional sense of those who make academic decisions, counsel students, or monitor the budget. They are, in fact, a slightly different breed, as the pages that follow will reveal.

About This Study

Approximately one-third of the 16,000 individual members of CASE say their primary responsibilities and interests are in fund raising. It was possible to draw a sample of these members for this study by selecting every tenth person on the alphabetized printout. Each person so identified received a two-page questionnaire, a cover letter, and a stamped return envelope.

Of the 500 fund raisers contacted, 206—just over 40%—responded. Since no follow-up was made, this group constitutes the final sample. Since they are employed by a diverse set of institutions from all regions of the nation, it can be assumed that they are reasonably representative of the larger population of academic fund raisers.

Here is what a tabulation of their responses revealed.

Demographics

If the sample of 206 fund raisers in academe who contributed data to this study is indeed representative, it reveals that in many ways they resemble other segments of the academic community. That means, of course, that they are atypical of our nation's population in general.

In short, fund raisers in academe are predominantly middle-aged white males who have a high level of educational attainment.

Sixty percent of the fund raisers who responded are male; 124 men as opposed to 81 women. Only one respondent refused to indicate his or her gender, revealing perhaps a refreshing lack of gender concerns in this emerging professional field.

Veteran fund raisers, however, report a shift in the ratio of men to women in the field. More and more women have entered the field in recent years, as attendance at CASE and NSFRE conferences readily confirms. It appears though that relatively few women fund raisers have moved to vice president and vice chancellor positions as yet. In the main, they are employed in entry or mid-level positions, but this too is changing.

Given the racial composition of higher education staffs, the mix of white and minority group members in the ranks of fund raisers should come as no surprise. Of those who were willing to indicate their race, 97% are white and only 3% are minority group members. It is interesting to note, however, that 20 respondents declined to specify their racial category. If they had, the proportion of whites in the group is likely to be higher. Further speculation of why more fund raisers are willing to indicate gender but not race is left to the reader.

Even reporting age is less of a problem for these fund raisers since only 10 of the 206 respondents declined to offer that information. Those who did indicate their ages provide evidence that fund raisers in academe are relatively young when compared, for example, with the aging cadre of professors and senior institutional administrators. The mean age of this group of fund raisers is only 40.5 years and the largest concentration of them is in the 31 to 40 year old category. Here is how the age groupings spread:

Under 30 years of age	9%
31 to 40 years old	43%
41 to 50 years old	28%
51 to 60 years old	17%
Over 60 years of age	3%

The reason more than half of fund raisers in academe have not yet celebrated their forty-first birthday is quite obvious. Institutions of higher education have been increasing their fund raising staffs or, in the cases of some public institutions, beginning to initially develop a fund raising unit.

Given the difficulty in funding positions for new fund raisers, many of the people attracted to these positions are young and sometimes inexperienced workers. Those that do have some experience, as future sections of this monograph will report, move over from other parts of the campus (faculty slots or student affairs assignments, for example), from volunteer roles, or from lower paying positions in nonprofit organizations outside of academe.

Another reason for growth in fund raising positions is the increasing frequency of capital campaigns by institutions of higher education. Campaigns require additional staff members and, when campaigns conclude, it is not unusual for some staff to remain as permanent members of the fund raising cadre. Thus, academe appears to have a growing group of relatively youthful and, it is assumed, energetic upwardly mobile fund raisers. Whether there is a correlation between that fact and annual increases in philanthropic gifts to institutions of higher education cannot be determined. Clearly other factors (for example, larger donor bases, improved solicitation techniques, better in-service training, and computerization) contribute much, but it is likely that youth and drive play important roles in continued fund raising success.

Academic Backgrounds

As might be expected, fund raisers in academe participate, at some time in life at least, as consumers as well as workers in the academic community. Virtually all the 206 fund raisers being described here earned bachelor's degrees; only three did not provide such information. Furthermore, 61%

hold master's degrees and 23% are doctoral degree recipients.

Their fields of study don't provide any surprises either—heavily concentrated in traditional academic disciplines at the undergraduate level but shifting toward professional fields for postgraduate study. More than 60% of undergraduate degrees are in traditional fields (71 specialized in arts and humanities, 23 in social and behavioral science, 16 in natural sciences and mathematics, and 18 in other nonprofessional fields). As undergraduates, 35 of these fund raisers studied business, 25 majored in education, and 15 earned degrees in other professional fields.

Graduate study, however, is a different story. Of the 126 master's degree holders, 47 majored in education, 16 in business, and 16 in other professional fields. Only 20 specialized in arts and humanities, 8 in social and behavioral science, 3 in natural sciences, and 16 in other nonprofessional fields.

At a doctoral level the trend continues. Of the 49 doctoral degree holders, 26 have degrees in education, 1 in business, and 3 in other professional fields. Ten report doctorates in arts and humanities, 5 in social and behavioral sciences, and 4 in other nonprofessional fields. The preponderance of education degrees at the graduate level may be explained in two ways. Programs for the study of higher education—a natural field of inquiry for college and university staff members—are housed in colleges of education. Beyond that, many such colleges are oriented toward inservice education of teachers and administrators and thus offer graduate study in the late afternoon and evening. Working fund raisers often take advantage of these study opportunities, combining employment with advanced degree work.

Current Position

Fund raisers surveyed in this study described the institutions in which they work. In general, they are employed by relatively large institutions that offer both undergraduate and graduate study.

Of the 198 respondents who included this information, 40% work in public colleges and universities, 35% serve independent institutions, and 25% garner support for church-related colleges and universities. These figures, of course, reflect the extent to which fund raisers in various types of institutions are members of CASE (which provided the mailing list) and also their predisposition to respond to questionnaires. The percentages above do, however, roughly approximate the proportion of public and private institutions in this country. Clearly, they do not approximate the proportion of students in public and private colleges since, as will be reported below, community colleges which now enroll about half of all higher education students are under-represented in the sample.

The fact is that only 4% of respondents in this study work at community and junior colleges. This under-representation results in large part because many community college fund raisers belong to the National Council for Resource Development, an affiliate of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. Furthermore, some two-year institutions, especially in the public sector, have only recently launched fund raising activities and generally they have small staffs heavily oriented toward seeking federal grants rather than gifts from private sources.

In addition to the two-year institutions, 25% of the respondents are from institutions granting only bachelor's degrees, 28% from institutions granting both bachelor's and master's degrees, and 43% from doctoral degree granting institutions. These proportions appear to be somewhat representative since institutions that grant doctorates tend to be larger, more comprehensive, and often multi-campus university systems. Their more extensive fund raising efforts frequently include assignment of fund raisers to each dean and major program head under coordination of campus and system advancement officers.

Years in Current Position

Perhaps the most startling finding produced by this survey is the number of years of service these fund raisers have in the positions they currently hold. Although two respondents did not report this information, the 204 who did indicated a range of from one to 17 years in their current positions. It is striking to note, however, that only 16% of these fund raisers have been in their current jobs for more than five years, which means that 84% of them have served only one to five years in their present assignments.

Here is how the years of experience in current positions distribute:

1 year	33%
2 year	22%
3 years	14%
4 years	8%
5 years	7%
5 to 17 years	16%

The mean number of years these fund raisers have served in their current positions is 4.1 years.

What makes this finding even more astounding is the fact that over half, actually 55% of the respondents, are either in their first or second year of service in their current positions. Seven out of 10 of them have been in their current positions for three or fewer years.

Data on years of service in previous fund raising positions of these respondents strengthens the impression that there are ample career advance-

ment opportunities available. The mean number of years of employment in the most recent prior positions of these respondents is 4.8 years. For the position they held immediately prior to that, the mean is 5.1 years. In each of the two prior positions, more than half of the respondents served three years or less.

This clearly illustrates the high degree of job mobility fund raisers enjoy and with which institutional leaders must deal. Expansion of fund raising staffs and increasing numbers of capital campaigns are no doubt factors contributing to this mobility. The supply-demand situation is also influenced by the relative sparsity of formal programs for preparing fund raising personnel, although there appears to be an increase in both credit and noncredit programs and courses on fund raising fundamentals.

On the negative side, some of the mobility is simply "job hopping," which one respondent called a "curse" to the field. There are, it seems, some itinerant fund raisers whose frequent moves help keep the years-in-service figures low. Another explanation of this finding is possible bias in the responding group. Veteran fund raisers may "deep six" questionnaires like the one used in this study while younger, newly assigned colleagues who are more interested in career development issues willingly respond. More likely, the harassed development director bucks it down to an assistant with a "Please respond" notation.

These matters notwithstanding, the fund raising field appears to offer both extensive employment opportunities and high job mobility. This is especially true for younger workers with experience as volunteers or entry level staff members. A related factor, of course, is the absence of formal training or credential requirements for entry into fund raising positions. A later section of this report addresses these training and credential issues.

Seeking New Positions

An aspect of job mobility is the desire of workers to seek new positions. These fund raisers were asked if they are currently seeking a new position and, if so, the reason for wanting to move. Furthermore, they were asked why they left their two prior positions in the field.

About 20% of the respondents reported they are actively seeking employment elsewhere. A few others said they are not looking but would consider interesting opportunities if invited to do so. This is not a particularly high proportion of job seekers, given opportunities in the field. It may be that respondents are reluctant to admit their interests. More likely, it is because so many of these fund raisers are short-timers in the jobs they currently hold.

Those who are seeking new positions give a variety of reasons for doing

so. Increased salary is mentioned frequently, as is the desire for more responsibility, greater challenge, and an opportunity "to administer my own shop." Other individual responses are personal ("don't like this area," "spouse was transferred"), relate to current duties ("want to do planned giving," "return to event planning"), or administration ("personnel problems," "lack of teamwork with president").

The primary reasons why these fund raisers decided to leave their previous positions are similar—desire for greater opportunity and challenge, more responsibility, and increased salary. A larger proportion admitted conflicts with senior development officers or with the institution's president. A few said unrealistic expectations placed on them prompted them to leave and a few even admitted they had been fired. Since about one quarter of the respondents did not provide information on these points, however, it is difficult to be more analytical about the reasons fund raisers move on to new positions.

Introduction to the Field

Becoming a fund raiser is quite clearly not the result of some conscious decision early in life. Few career counselors are suspected of providing information on this potential vocation and, except in rare cases, college and university catalogs list no relevant courses. Fund raisers surveyed in this study were asked to recall what stimulated their interest in fund raising and their awareness of fund raising as a career field.

Volunteer experiences emerged as the major influence for embarking on a fund raising career. In some cases, these experiences began in college, but more often the idea of becoming a fund raiser is planted after graduation. Some respondents served as class agents or volunteered to assist with phonathons and capital campaigns. Others became involved with arts and theater organizations, the League of Women Voters, and other nonprofit organizations in their communities. Still others were initiated through their work with church stewardship committees and public charities.

Working at other jobs in a college or university is another point of entry. A number of respondents learned about fund raising opportunities through their work as admissions officers, public relations directors, coordinators of alumni programs, faculty members, or administrators in other academic units. Several worked in development offices as students and continued on as regular staff members.

The influence of people is another stimulating factor. In several cases a college president, recognizing some fund raising potential in an acquaintance, suggested entering the field or, better yet, offered the acquaintance a job. Knowing someone who works in a development office introduces

some fund raisers to the field and one person learned of such career opportunities from a development officer, the father of a college friend.

Not surprisingly, a substantial number of fund raisers enter the field quite by happenstance. A job is advertised and they get it. The organization for which they work decides a development effort is needed and assigns the task to a current staff member. One recent doctoral graduate sought an academic position but "refused to take the vow of poverty associated with teaching." A fund raising position provided a more acceptable salary.

Learning the Craft

Unlike accounting or optometry or other highly skilled vocations, fund raising as a field of study is not formalized by establishment of specific academic departments or degrees, although some steps in that direction are being taken. As a result, most fund raisers acquire their knowledge and skills elsewhere. Some obvious sources of such training are experiences on the job, self-study, or the array of conferences, seminars, and short courses offered by associations or by private entrepreneurs. Of course, other educational, work, and life experiences surely contribute to preparation for fund raising careers.

To ascertain the views of fund raisers on where they learned various aspects of their vocation, they were asked to indicate what educational, work, and life experiences contribute to their abilities as a fund raiser. Their responses reveal that working in a development office is the single most important source of training.

Since most practicing fund raisers have little, if any, formal training in the field, it is not surprising that their knowledge of fund raising techniques is attributed overwhelmingly to employment as a development officer. Attending conferences and institutes contribute to a moderate degree, but academic training, volunteering, self-study, or other employment are of little value.

The ability to interact easily with people of influence and affluence, an important fund raising skill, is learned mainly through family and home experiences. Employment as a fund raiser or in other jobs contributes moderately to this skill, and, somewhat surprisingly, volunteering is only a weak influence, while academic training and self-study make little or no contribution.

Understanding philanthropic motives of prospective donors is gained through development work, and all other influences are regarded as weak factors in developing this understanding. In like manner, the ability to apply fund raising techniques and success in fund raising are clearly the result of experience on the job in a development office. Again, all other

sources of these skills are thought to be only weak contributing factors.

Skill in providing staff support for senior administrators is most often gained by past employment outside of fund raising, but experience as a fund raiser is a rather close second. None of the other factors, even volunteer experiences, are described as important contributors to this skill.

The ability to communicate effectively with other people is a skill fund raisers attribute to their college and graduate school experiences. Home and family influences and experience in jobs outside of fund raising are regarded as only moderate contributors to communication skills.

Finally, knowing how to motivate volunteers appears to be a skill learned from personally serving as a volunteer. Working in a development office and other outside employment contributes moderately to this ability. On the other hand, home and family experiences, academic preparation, CASE conferences, and self-study are seen as unimportant influences on the ability to motivate volunteers.

Becoming a Fund Raiser

Tracing the jobs held by fund raisers back three iterations provides a method of determining their entry into the fund raising vocation. Accepting a fund raising job is, of course, closely related to the manner in which a likely candidate is introduced to the field. As the responses reported below indicate, being associated with a higher education institution often provides entree to fund raising careers. Many future development officers, however, begin their careers in the nonprofit sector as well as in private business and industry.

Thirty percent of the fund raisers responding to this survey were in some academic position—either faculty member or administrator—when they accepted their first fund raising position. Another 7% were college or university alumni directors and an additional 2% came from positions in public school systems.

Among the academics turned fund raisers are professors from criminal justice, economics, history, and music in addition to a few business officers, budget directors, admissions and counseling staffers, a department chairman, a graduate dean, assorted deans in other academic fields, a continuing education director, a presidential assistant, and finally a former college president. More surprising are the previous positions of some other fund raisers. One was an assistant basketball coach and another a director of athletics. From the public schools came a high school teacher, a principal, and a former superintendent of schools.

Moving from the nonprofit sector to a higher education fund raising

position was a natural step for 14% of those responding. Their previous activities included management (and sometimes fund raising) for community and social service agencies, a symphony orchestra, political campaigns, a community theater, a national scholarship organization, religious denominations, health organizations, and even a chamber of commerce.

From the private sector came future fund raisers who held positions in market research, property management and real estate, banking, publishing, a retail department store, the chemical industry, and aircraft manufacturing among other similar lines of work. One fund raiser had been a university vice president. He left that job to join a restaurant chain and later returned as a fund raiser in academe.

Another 11% of the respondents came from other vocational areas, including the military, nursing, government, consulting, and the practice of law. Finally, 19% of the sample reported that they are now in their third fund raising position so it is not possible to ascertain their earlier employment. (The fact that nearly one fifth of these fund raisers are in their third such position clearly illustrates again the short tenure and frequency of job change in this field.)

Career Paths

Further examination of the job changes made by these fund raisers provides an interesting, if somewhat impressionistic, sense of career mobility in this field. In most cases it is possible to chart two successive job changes and to draw conclusions about the implications of these changes in terms of career advancement. Of course, conclusions offered here are not relevant for respondents in their first fund raising positions.

The primary purpose of this analysis is to determine if fund raisers approximate the career development paradigm offered by Schien. (See Schein, Edgar H. *Career Dynamics: Matching Individual and Organizational Needs*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1978.) Briefly stated, this concept of career development suggests that as workers gain experience in a given field they move from the periphery to the central core of knowledge and decision making in the vocation. They gain access to proprietary information and increasingly deal with matters of policy and organizational survival.

Except for some special cases which will be discussed later, there are four career paths that fund raisers travel. They are: Upward mobility within the same institution; lateral movement within the same institution; upward mobility as a result of changing institutions; and, lateral movement to other institutions.

Strict quantification of data such as those on career paths is foolish, if not impossible, and would surely lead to what has been called "misplaced concreteness". What follows then, is a somewhat subjective but, it is hoped, informative picture of career development experiences by fund raisers in academe.

Two conclusions emerge from the analysis. First, upward mobility is more likely to occur if a fund raiser moves to another institution than if he or she remains in the same institution. Second, there is a considerable amount of lateral movement between jobs in the field and lateral movement occurs more often when a fund raiser moves from one institution to another.

These data suggest that moving from one institution to another almost doubles the possibility that upward mobility will occur. That is, fund raisers who take a new job in another institution are likely to assume more senior level positions, if job titles and responsibilities reported by these fund raiser can be taken at face value. To be sure, upward mobility does occur within the same institution, as examples cited below indicate. The point is, it appears to occur more often if the fund raiser relocates.

Moving elsewhere to move up is both natural and necessary, points out one veteran fund raiser. In many institutions, especially those with small staffs, upward mobility is unlikely if not impossible. Fund raisers who seek better salaries and more responsibility must look to other institutions. This is particularly the case for fund raisers who specialize in one aspect of the field (e.g., annual fund, planned giving, etc.).

Examples of upward mobility in the same institution include: major gifts officer to executive director for development; director of alumni and annual fund programs to vice president; planned giving director to vice president and then to university trust officer; capital campaign staff assistant to associate director for foundation support; special programs coordinator to director of development.

Moving to another institution produced the following examples of upward career mobility: Director of foundation relations to executive director (in one case) or vice president (in another) for development; coordinator of annual giving to vice president; director of development in a small private university to vice president in a large public university; director of development in a liberal arts college to vice president in another liberal arts college to associate vice president in a major university medical center; and, assistant to the president with development responsibilities in a small liberal arts college to director of development in a "think tank" to vice president for development of a public university foundation.

Going elsewhere increases the chances of obtaining a more senior position, but going elsewhere can often mean a lateral move. A development

director at a seminary now holds a similar position at a school within a university; the vice president for development at a church related college made two successive moves to identical positions at other church related colleges; one respondent has been vice president for development at three quite similar private universities; and, in what may not even be a lateral move, the annual fund director at a major research university is now responsible for capital gifts at a small liberal arts college.

Similar lateral moves occur within an institution, but not quite as often it seems. A planned giving officer assumes responsibility for capital gifts in a small college; the corporate and foundation relations officer in a liberal arts college moves to become the planned giving officer; the director of development for a school within a large university becomes the assistant director for planned giving.

Then there are the special cases. A college president finds being director of development elsewhere more to his liking; the executive director of a public college foundation returns to the environment of a small liberal arts college as chief development officer. In another instance the executive officer of a political party, "burned out in politics", becomes associate director and, after three years, director of development at a private college. A development director at a small liberal arts college, seeking "career advancement in a metropolitan setting," assumes leadership of the development program at a private medical school. Two years later, citing lack of institutional commitment to fund raising, a better career opportunity is found in a similar position at a small women's college.

The final special case illustrates both negative and positive elements of job mobility in the fund raising field. After four years as a professional school development officer, one fund raiser became campaign director at another public research university. After three years the individual "had to" leave that position, spent three more years at another institution, and is now in a fourth development job elsewhere.

All of the above suggests that fund raisers in academe do experience considerable upward career mobility within institutions and somewhat more through relocation. In doing so they appear to assume roles at the decision-making and policy-making core of the vocation. But the path of career development can lead to other peripheral positions or, worse yet, toward even less desirable employment.

Sense of Professionalism

Increasingly there is talk of professionalism among the ranks of fund raisers in academe. Both CASE and NSFRE have produced statements of ethical practice. A "Colloquium on Professionalism in Institutional Ad-

vancement" was conducted by the former organization and NSFRE has an Ethics Committee and a procedure for enforcing its code. As the cadre of fund raisers grows larger, and as their efforts yield more and more dollars, concern for professional conduct has become an increasingly important item on the agendas of association leaders.

This study sampled the extent to which professional concerns are a pressing issue in the minds of practicing fund raisers. Unfortunately, the evidence produced here is far from compelling. These fund raisers exhibit only a modest understanding and sense of concern for the elements which most scholars consider basic identifying characteristics of established professions.

Respondents were asked to rate the importance of six professional characteristics in response to the question: What should be done to make fund raising more like the so-called "true professions"? Not even half of those who responded to this question rated any of the six characteristics as "very important." Many respondents dismissed the characteristics as "not important," and in each case about a third of the respondents selected "somewhat important." Here are their ratings for each of the six characteristics.

Increasing the fund of knowledge and the theoretical base is widely accepted as a fundamental requirement as any field moves toward greater professionalism. The ratings of this element are:

Very important	38%
Somewhat important	48%
Not important	10%
No response	4%

Another professionalizing element is the adoption of a code of ethics and the imposition of sanctions against those who violate it. The ratings of this element are:

Very important	45%
Somewhat important	37%
Not important	13%
No response	5%

Requirement of formal courses or seminars as preparation for entry into a vocational field is almost universally associated with vocations generally recognized as professions. The ratings of this element are:

Very important	30%
Somewhat important	43%
Not important	23%
No response	4%

Beyond formal training programs, many professional fields mandate some type of formal examination leading to licensure for those who would enter practice of the vocation. Clearly this is a sensitive issue with fund raisers in academe. Their ratings on this element are:

Very important	15%
Somewhat important	37%
Not important	48%
No response	0%

As leaders in a vocation strive toward greater professionalism, an activity deemed vital to the process is some attempt to clarify the central roles and functions of practitioners in the field. The ratings of these fund raisers on this element are:

Very important	46%
Somewhat important	36%
Not important	13%
No response	5%

The sixth characteristic involves efforts by practitioners in a vocation to encourage public acceptance of the lofty character of the work that they do. The ratings of this characteristic are:

Very important	38%
Somewhat important	31%
Not important	25%
No response	6%

These data clearly suggest that fund raising for the benefit of academic institutions has not progressed very far along the continuum of professionalization. And it is unlikely that the fund raisers described in this monograph differ greatly from their counterparts who garner support for nonprofit organizations or health care institutions. Clearly this is a matter that demands the attention of leaders in the field.

Making Fund Raising More Professional

Little unanimity of opinion exists among these fund raisers about how to improve the professional standing of practitioners in this vocation. Respondents voiced many suggestions and their notions range from self interest to idealism.

Professionalism can be enhanced simply by raising salaries, assert ten fund raisers, the single largest group to agree on any one tactic. A larger cohort, however, suggest a variety of pedagogical approaches to the issue. Teaching about philanthropy in high school and college is one notion, while

others call for more and better continuing education through short courses, seminars, and other "training" experiences. Other respondents think "academic courses" and degree programs (mainly in business schools or nonprofit organization management centers) are the answer.

The private sector backgrounds of some fund raisers appear to color their views on the issue. One suggests sending fund raisers to "sales school" and another (a retired business executive turned fund raiser) said, "Recruit individuals with business experience who know the importance of looking and acting in a professional manner."

There is, in fact, a modest amount of negative reaction to the mention of "true professions" and ideas for making fund raising more professional. One respondent circled the words "true professions" and wrote, "This always puzzels [sic] me." In this case, the reason for puzzlement may not be difficult to discern, yet he was not the only fund raiser who seems to reflect a limited understanding of the professionalization process.

"Stop thinking that it is not [a true profession]" says another person, and two other respondents agree, "... it already is." Yet another asserts that professionalism is "... inherent in the nature of the business," and finally one fund raiser dismisses all such talk by asking, "Why worry about being a 'true profession'?" To be sure, these views are held by a very small number of fund raisers surveyed. Yet such comments suggest the need for increased awareness and appreciation of the elements that characterize professions which enjoy public acceptance in our society.

Several respondents point out that associations in the field are beginning to address this need through their publications and continuing education activities. Still another respondent thinks the "application of professional management and marketing techniques" would raise professionalism, while a small group aver that granting professional recognition through awards and a "fellows" designation will do the job.

Issuing credentials to fund raisers through some form of licensure or "accreditation" (meaning, it is assumed, certification by organizations like NSFRE and CASE) is also mentioned. One respondent suggests that this could be accomplished if associations of fund raisers from the academic, nonprofit, and hospital sectors join forces. Yet there are some strong voices opposed to both courses and credentials. "Don't model ourselves after the insurance industry," said one respondent who agrees with another's assertion that "exams or licensure should not be mandated."

Less formal approaches suggested by the respondents include simply "recruiting better people" and "building commitment to integrity and the institution." Increasing "understanding of the importance of fund raising" among faculty members, administrators, and trustees is another suggestion. One respondent hopes this might discourage appointing "hired guns"

whose "only cause is themselves."

The idealists think "a sound liberal arts education," a "code of ethics" or "encouragement and proper sensitivity for the job" will help. Placing fund raising under fields that are "more established as professions such as enrollment management" is the suggestion of a respondent whose job description falls in that category. Finally, one fund raiser simply said, "keep networking."

A group of more pragmatic recommendations address job security issues. "Grant tenure and sabbaticals," said one respondent. Longer tenure will "discourage job-hopping," said another. Stabilize the job market so the academic community does not consider us transients," is the plea of yet another respondent. This line of reasoning was pointedly summed up by the fund raiser who asserts, "Job hopping is a curse to the profession."

Comment and Speculation

What is written here speaks for itself. These pages report in a straightforward manner factual information about one group of academic fund raisers and what they think about the vocation they practice. In some cases, of course, interpretation of their comments was required so the possibility of the biased reporting is clearly present.

To the extent that these fund raisers represent all their counterparts in colleges and universities throughout the nation, this study tells us some important things about the men and women associated with this important vocation, whether it be called institutional advancement, development, university relations, public affairs, or just simply fund raising.

We have learned, for one thing, that fund raisers in academe have many admirable characteristics. They are predominantly young, white, well educated, and increasingly more equally divided between female and male. Their study of the arts and sciences turns toward professional fields as they seek advanced degrees. They are short on tenure in current positions and long on mobility, judging by their previous employment records and their interest in more responsibility and larger paychecks.

Fund raisers in academe are introduced to the field and learn the craft in a variety of informal, even accidental, ways. Many come from outside the academic community and most exhibit considerable upward career mobility, admittedly in a field where demand for and supply of experienced, and hopefully competent, workers has not yet reached balance. Beyond all this, fund raisers have a somewhat constrained view of professionalism in their vocation and of what can be done to advance its movement towards recognition as one of the true professions.

Two findings of this study, those related to career mobility and to views on professionalism, are clearly the most important and, as such, are deserving of further comment. In this regard, two questions are raised. They deal with the environment within which academic fund raisers work and with the relationship between competence and professionalism.

In a field such as fund raising, characterized by both upward and lateral mobility, what can be done to create a work environment that increases commitment, enhances success, and stimulates professionalism? It is clear that both fund raisers and the institutions that employ them would be better off if such an environment could be put in place. Needless to say, both fund raisers and institutional leaders have a role to play in achieving this goal, but the initiative probably rests with campus executives and governing boards.

Of primary importance are the expectations placed on fund raisers. If the president anticipates unrestricted dollars far beyond what a realistic appraisal of the donor base suggests, it may send the fund raiser in search of employment rather than gifts. If trustees overestimate the potential for gifts among their associates and underplay their own roles in seeking support, they send negative signals to their development professionals. Beyond that, the environment (and thus commitment, success, and professionalism) improves in rough proportion to adequacy of support staff, a meaningful role in strategic institutional planning, and the amount of personal recognition afforded fund raisers. All of these things are vital elements of the positive chemistry that can exist between fund raiser and institution.

On the other hand, fund raisers might take a longer view of their present situations, involve themselves more in campus life, and soak up more of the academic values. This will not be easy for many fund raisers, especially those whose earlier employment was outside the academic environment. And, there is ample evidence that attendance at college or graduate school doesn't guarantee any lasting internalization of prevailing values. For most newly appointed fund raisers, getting plugged into the environment will take some thought, some time, and more than a little involvement.

The second question addresses the meaning of professionalism. Is there more to professional behavior than just competence? Suggestions from these fund raisers about how to make fund raising more professional really focus on how well practitioners perform their jobs. That is an extremely limited view of professionalism and, if such a view prevails throughout the total cohort of academic fund raisers, it is a serious problem.

An insightful article by David Brown ("Professional Virtue: A Dangerous Kind of Humbug," *Change*, November/December 1985) addresses this point. He charges that professionals "rarely question the worth of what any colleague does as long as it is competently done." When we treat compe-

tence as a virtue, perhaps as the only virtue, we are at risk, asserts Brown. He continues:

> In a society then where the professional and technical class will soon be the largest single group, competence alone cannot save us. In fact, competence alone may do us in. Professionals will literally not know what they're doing if they have no intellectual or moral basis for understanding how they use what their enterprise has produced and what ends it should serve.

It is professionalism in that broad sense that must be internalized by fund raisers, and indeed by all members of the community, academic or otherwise. It is the realm beyond artful case statements, successful campaigns, and happy alumni where real professionalism dwells. Persons associated with the fund raising vocation might fruitfully explore those regions.

Clarifying appropriate roles and functions for fund raisers is of vital concern. Defining lofty ideals and garnering public acceptance of these aspirations cannot be ignored. Neither can the field permit lore and personal experience to substitute for organized knowledge and theoretical ideas that can guide behavior. And if this intellectual content is best transmitted didactically and tested objectively, it is not likely that dire consequences will befall the field. If certification and sanctions against malpractice serve useful purposes in other vocations, it is difficult to assert that fund raisers will be harmed by such professionalizing elements.

If the fiscal health of higher education in America depends ever increasingly on the work of academic fund raisers, then the health of fund raising as a professional endeavor takes on even greater importance. There is much to be learned and much work to be done. It is to that end that these words are written.